*of Sokrates* (London, 1865); C. F. Hermann, *De Socratis accusa- toribus* (Göttingen, 1854); W. H. Thompson, *The Phaedrus of Plato* (London, 1868), Appendix I. ; Joel, *Der echte und der Xenophontische Sokrates* (1901). For the view taken in the present article with regard to the δαιμ⅛ιoρ, see the writer’s paper “ On the *όαμώιηον* of Socrates,” in the *Journal of Philology,* v.; and cf. Chr. Meiners, *Vermischte philosophische Schriften* (Leipzig, 1776)—“ in moments of 'Schwärmerei ’ Socrates took for the voice of an attendant genius what was in reality an instantaneous presentiment in regard to the issue of a contemplated act.” For a fuller statement of the writer’s view of Plato’s relations to Socrates, see a paper on Plato’s *Republic,* vi. 509 D seq., in the *Journal of Philology,* vol. x., and a series of papers on “ Plato’s Later Theory of Ideas,” in vols. x., xi., xiii.’, xiv., xv., xxv. of the same periodical.

See also Sophists and Ethics. (H. Ja.)

**SOCRATES,** the name of a famous 5th-century church historian. In the course of the last twenty-five years (425-450) of the reign of Theodosius II. (the first thoroughly Byzantine emperor) at least six church histories were written in Greek within the limits of the Eastern Empire—those, namely, of Philostorgius the Arian, of Philip of Side, of Socrates, of Sozomen, of Theodoret and of Hesychius. Of these the first, no longer extant except in fragments, seems to have been the most important. Those of Philip and of Hesychius (the former an untrustworthy and dreary performance mentioned by Socrates [vii. 26, 27]) have also perished. The remaining three are now our main sources for church history from Constantine to Theodosius II. None of them has ventured upon a fresh treatment of the period dealt with by Eusebius; all three begin their narratives about the point where his closes. In the West the *Church History* of that author had already been continued by Rufinus and his *Chronicle* by Jerome, and the work of Rufinus was certainly known to the Byzantines. Nor did these write independently of each other, for Sozomen (*q.v.*) certainly had before him the work of Socrates, and Theodoret (*q.v.)* knew both of them. The three histories together became known in the West from the 6th century through the selection which Cassiodorus caused to be made from them, and it is to this selection (if we leave Rufinus and Jerome out of account) that the middle ages were mainly indebted for all they knew of the Arian controversies, and of the period generally between the Councils of Nice and Ephesus.

The 'Eκκλ^σcαστu⅛ ιστορία of Socrates, still extant in seven books, embracing the period from 306 to 439, was written in 439, or within a few years thereafter. He was born and brought up at Constantinople. The date of his birth is uncertain, but it cannot have been far from 380. Of the facts of his life we know practically nothing, except that he was not a cleric but a “ scholasticus ” or advocate. Of the occasion, plan and object of his work he has himself informed us in the prologues to his first, second, fifth and sixth books. It is dedicated to one Theodoras, who had urged him to write such a history. He had no thorough preparation for the task, and for the period down to the death of Constantius (361) was practically dependent on Rufinus. After his work was finished he became a student of Athanasius’ writings and came to see how untrustworthy his guide had been. He accordingly rewrote his first two books (see Η. *E.* ii. 1) certainly before 450 and probably before 444 (see Geppert p. 8), and it is only this revision that has reached us. The chief sources from which he drew were: (r) the *Church History,* the *Life of Constantine* and certain theological works of Eusebius; (2) the *Church History* of Rufinus; (3) certain works of Athanasius; (4) the no longer extant Συναγωγή *των συνοδικών* of the Macedonian and semi-Arian Sabinus—a collection of acts of councils with commentaries, brought down to the reign of Theodosius I. (this was a main source) ; (5) the *Constantinopolitan Chronicle;* (6) possibly a collection of imperial biographies; (7) lists of bishops; (8) collections of letters by members of the Arian and orthodox parties. He also used writings of Gregory Thaumaturgus, Archelaus, Acacius, Didymus, George of Laodicea, Gregory Nazianzen, Timothy of Berytus (see Lietzmann, *Apollinaris von Laodicea,* p.44), Nestorius, Eusebius Scholasticus, Philip of Side, Evagrius, Palladius, Eutropius, the emperor Julian and orations of Libanius and Themistius; and he was apparently acquainted with some of the works of Origen and with Pamphilus’ *Apologia pro Origene.* (On his sources see Jeep, and especially Geppert.) Jeep alleges (pp. 149 sqq.), but without adequate proof, that he made use of Philostorgius. As regards profane history his materials were exceedingly defective. Thus, for example, he confesses that his reason for not giving an account of the wars of Constantine is his inability to ascertain anything certain about them (v. *praef.).* His reckonings by Olympiads are generally wrong, the error arising chiefly from carelessness. He is greatly indebted to oral tradition and to the testimony of eye-witnesses, especially of members of the Novatian community in Constantinople; some things also he has set down from per­sonal knowledge. The contents of the closing books are for the most part derived from oral tradition, from the narratives of friends and countrymen, from what was still generally known and current in the capital about past events, and from the ephemeral literature of the day.

The theological position of Socrates, so far as he can be said to have had one, is at once disclosed in his unlimited admiration for Origen. All the enemies of the great Alexandrian he regards merely as empty and vain obscurantists; for the orthodoxy of his hero he appeals to Athanasius. Closely connected with his high regard for Origen are his appreciation of science generally and the moderation of his judgment on all dogmatic questions. According to him, Ελλτjm⅛ *πaιSda* is quite indispensable within the Church; many Greek philosophers were not far from the knowledge of God, as is proved by their triumphant arguments against atheists and gainsayers. of divine providence. The apostles did not set them­selves against the study of Greek literature and science; Paul had even made a thorough study of them himself. The Scriptures, it is true, contain all that appertains to faith and life, but give no clue to the art of confuting gainsayers. Greek science, therefore, must not be banished from the Church, and the tendency within the Church so to deal with it is wrong. This point of view was the common one of the majority of educated Christians at that period, and is not to be regarded as exceptionally liberal. The same holds true of the position of Socrates in regard to dogmatic questions. On the one hand, indeed, orthodoxy and heresy are symbolized to his mind by the wheat and the tares respectively; he clings to the naive opinion of Catholicism, that contemporary orthodoxy has prevailed within the Church from the first; he recognizes the true faith only in the mystery of the Trinity; he judges heretics who have been already condemned as interlopers, as impudent innovators, actuated by bad and self-seeking motives; he apologizes for having so much as treated of Arianism at all in his history of the Church; he believes in the inspiration of the ecclesiastical councils as much as in that of the Scriptures themselves. But, on the other hand, he takes absolutely no interest in dogmatic subtleties and clerical disputes.; he regards them as the source of great evils, and expresses his craving for peace: “ one ought to adore the ineffable mystery in silence.” This attitude, which was that of most educated Byzantine laymen, has in particular cases made it possible for him to arrive at very free judgments. Even granting that some feeble remains of antique reserve may have contributed to this, and even although some of.it is certainly to be set down to his disposition and temperament, still it was his religious passivity that here deter­mined the character of Socrates and made him a typical example of the later Byzantine Christianity. If Socrates had lived about the year 325, he certainly would not have ranked himself on the side of Athanasius, but would have joined the party of mediation. . But— the *oμoobσu>s* has been laid down, and must be recognized as correctly expressing the mystery; only one ought to rest satisfied with that word and with the repudiation of Arianism. Anything more, every new distinction, is mischievous. The controversy in its details is a *vυκτoμaχla* to him, full of misunderstandings. Some­times he gives prominence, and correctly, to the fact that the disputants partially failed to understand one another, because they had separate interests at heart—those on the one side desiring above everything to guard against polytheism, those on the other being most afraid of Sabellianism. He did not fail, however, to recognize also that the controversies frequently had their root in mere emula­tion, slander and sophistry. Not unfrequently he passes very sharp judgments on whole groups of bishops. In the preface to. his fifth book he excuses his trenching on the region of political history on the ground of his desire to spare his readers the disgust which perusal of the endless disputes of the bishops could not fail to excite, and in that to his sixth book he prides himself on never having flattered even the orthodox bishops. This attitude of his has given him a certain measure of impartiality. Constantius, and even Julian— not Valens, it is true—are estimated very fairly. The Arian Goths who died for their religion are recognized as genuine martyrs. His characterizations of Cyril and Nestorius, and his narrative and criti­cism of the beginnings of the Christological controversy, are models of candour and historical conscientiousness. In frequent instances, moreover, he acknowledges his own incompetency to give an opinion